

1      **REMARKS**

2      Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject  
3      application. Claims 1, 15, 25, 26, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, and 34 are amended. Claims  
4      1 to 34 remain pending in this application.

5

6      **35 U.S.C. § 103**

7      In the Office Action dated July 18, 2002, claims 1-34 stand rejected under  
8      35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over the Kathail et al (U.S. Patent Number  
9      5,802,365, hereinafter the Kathail patent) in view of Cavill (U.S. Patent Number  
10     6,003,069, hereinafter the Cavill Patent). Applicant respectfully traverses the  
11     rejection because the Kathail patent taken alone, or in combination with the Cavill  
12     patent, fails to teach or suggest the concepts taught in claims 1 to 34.

13

14     **The Applicant now distinguishes each claimset in order:**

15     To distinguish the Kathail/Cavill combination from **claim 1**, as amended,  
16     the Applicant emphasizes that there is no suggestion in either the Kathail patent  
17     nor the Cavill patent to use “the driver identifier to select a closest matching driver  
18     of a plurality of drivers to install at the server” using the driver identifier, and to  
19     “install, at the server, the selected driver”.

20     Applicant describes the terms “client” and “server” as typically used in  
21     computer system in a manner that has gained a general acceptance. The usage of  
22     these terms is reflected in Fig. 1 (and described in page 5 line 7 to page 6 line 9) of  
23     the present disclosure. Notably, on page 1, lines 7 to 12, it is stated “In a typical  
24     server-client system, a server computer is connected to several client computers or  
25     terminals via a network. In such systems, applications are executed at the server

1 rather than at the client." It is also stated on page 1, columns 14 to 15 "A server in  
2 such a system typically has an operating system that can run several client sessions  
3 concurrently."

4 The Applicant emphasizes the difference between the usage of the term  
5 "client" as used in the pending application which uses a client/server system  
6 compared to the usage of the term "client" as recited in the Kathail patent. As  
7 such, for the following reasons, the Applicant disagrees with the conclusion in the  
8 first line in paragraph 4 of the Office Action dated July 18, 2002 that "Kathail  
9 teaches receiving a driver identifier for a printer attached to a client by the client."  
10 (emphasis added). The Kathail patent uses the word "client" to describe a client of  
11 a printer driver (such as an application) instead of a client under the client/server  
12 meaning of the word as in the present application. Kathail states in column 31,  
13 lines 21-30: "Once loaded, a driver must be installed in a Unit Table (stored in  
14 memory) to become available to Device Manager clients ("applications"). .... For  
15 example, SCSI drivers use the range 32 to 38 as a convention to their clients." In  
16 performing a word search on the USPTO database of the Kathail patent, the word  
17 "server" does not appear while the word "client" appears several times.

18 To accentuate this difference in the usage of the word "client" between  
19 Kathail and the usage of the word "client" as used in the present application, note  
20 that the Kathail patent further states in column 40, lines 56-59: "Uninitialized and  
21 unopened devices or services that may be used by client applications are located,  
22 initialized, and opened at the time that a client makes a request for the devices or  
23 services." The Kathail patent additionally states in column 41, line 63 to column  
24 42, line 1: "There is a distinction between device initialization and device opening.  
25 A device opening action is a connection-oriented response to client requests.

1 Device drivers should expect to run with multiple Open and Close commands. This  
2 means that each driver is responsible for counting open requests from clients, and  
3 must not close itself until all clients have issued close requests."

4 As such, Kathail describes the term "client" as a client of the device  
5 driver. By comparison, the term "client" as claimed within the present application  
6 relates to a client-server computer system. Applicant submits that Kathail's  
7 Dynamic Matching Device does not teach the server-client environment of the  
8 present disclosure.

9 The Applicant agrees with the assessment in paragraph 4 of the Office  
10 Action that the Kathail patent does not "explicitly teach installing a print driver on  
11 the server side." Applicant asserts that there is no server side suggested in Kathail  
12 largely because the computer is not necessarily a client nor a server as claimed in  
13 the client/server system of the present disclosure.

14 The Examiner states in the Office Action mailed July 18, 2002 that the  
15 Kathail patent teaches "installing the selected driver" and "printing using the  
16 installed driver." The Applicant emphasizes that Kathail does not teach, or  
17 suggest, how to install a selected driver in a client/server computer system. One  
18 skilled in the art has to go elsewhere for these teachings to formulate this rejection.  
19 Most notably, the Office Action is relying on the teachings of the present  
20 disclosure to formulate this rejection.

21 In considering the Cahill patent, the Applicant notes that while Cahill does  
22 show a client/server system, there is no teaching of selecting at least one of the  
23 plurality of printer drivers for installation. This language is similar to as claimed  
24 in claim 1. Cahill instead states in column 2, lines 36-45:  
25

1 "the present invention presents a new printer driver system which is  
2 surprisingly effective for use with NCs (Network Computers). In its  
3 simplest terms, the present invention divides the print task up into  
4 portions that can be processed locally and portions that can be processed  
5 by a server. Typically, the server will be more capable of processing  
6 data than the NC and will have a greater amount of storage space. The  
7 benefits of the invention are that the server is used for temporary storage  
8 and processing, thereby alleviating the burden on the NC."

9 To provide this interaction to effect printing between the client and the  
10 server, however, Cavill must provide great limitations on the printer driver that are  
11 not required by present claims 1-34. Cavill states "Under the present invention, if  
12 the driver is written in a platform independent language such as the Java®  
13 programming language, then the same driver software can be used on any NC  
14 device that supports the Java Virtual Machine (JVM) definition. The only  
15 additional requirement for this platform independence is the definition of a  
16 common API that is the source of the graphics and text primitives." Cavill  
17 therefore provides platform independence as the only workable solution for  
18 selecting printer drivers to be installed in his system. There is no suggestion in the  
19 Cahill patent, however, of selecting at least one of the plurality of printer drivers  
20 for installation as claimed in claim 1. One skilled in the art upon considering  
21 Cavill would not know which printer driver to select nor where (in the claimed  
22 client/server system) to install the driver. This claimed feature is therefore lacking  
23 in both the Kathail patent and the Cahill patent. The Applicant therefore contends  
24 that maintaining the present rejection considering this prior art required the use of  
25

1 impermissible hindsight, since this claimed feature is not taught nor suggested by  
2 either reference relied on in the Office Action dated July 18, 2002.

3 Further, claim 1 includes the language “receiving at the server a driver  
4 identifier for a printer that can print information at the client”. The Kathail patent  
5 does not include a server, and as such cannot receive the driver identifier for a  
6 printer attached to the client at the server. The Cavill patent, which does include a  
7 server, does not receive a driver identifier for a printer that is used to select a  
8 closest matching driver of a plurality of drivers to install at the server. Instead,  
9 Cavill’s driver is written in a platform independent language, and therefore does  
10 not require a server to select a closest matching driver. The only suggestion in the  
11 Kathail/Cavill combination to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide a  
12 printer attached to a client is provided by the teachings of the present disclosure.

13 Claim 1 includes the language “installing, at the server, the selected driver.”  
14 The Kathail patent, which has no server, cannot teach installing the selected driver  
15 at the server. The Cavill patent installs at the server “a driver written in platform  
16 independent language.” Since the present disclosure as set forth in claim 1 does  
17 not require a platform independent language, the teachings of Cavill teach away  
18 from present claim 1.

19 Claim 1 also includes the language “allowing applications executing on the  
20 server to print to the printer using the installed driver”. The Kathail patent, which  
21 has no server, cannot teach allowing applications executing on the server to  
22 print...”. The Cavill patent teaches executing platform independent languages to  
23 execute on the server. Since present claim 1 does not execute platform  
24 independent language, the teachings of Cavill teach away from the presently  
25

1 claimed disclosure. As such, it is improper to suggest that the Kathail/Cavill  
2 combination would yield the concepts of claim 1.

3 Combining the Kathail patent and the Cahill patent (to provide the  
4 Kathail/Cahill combination) would not overcome their lack of teaching of present  
5 claims 1-34. One having ordinary skill in the art, upon considering the Kathail  
6 patent, would not have applied the specific computer to a client or a server in a  
7 client-server environment. The Cavill patent does not teach “selecting a closest  
8 matching driver of a plurality of drivers to install” as claimed in claim 1. Instead,  
9 *enhanced capability*  
Cavill selects a printer driver based on platform independence. Actually, the  
10 selecting process performed by Kathail and Cavill are inconsistent. There is no  
11 teaching to combine the teachings of the Kathail patent (selecting a printer driver  
12 in a single system) with the teachings of the Cavill patent (printing on a  
13 client/server system where the installed printer driver is platform independent) to  
14 yield the present disclosure as claimed. As such, the platform independence  
15 requirement of Cavill would destroy any teachings of Kathail to select one printer  
16 driver from a plurality of printer drivers. The Examiner is not free to take  
17 teachings piecemeal from different references to formulate a 35 U.S.C. §103  
18 rejection. Instead, there must be some teaching for the combination.

19 Applicant submits that claims 2 to 14 define over the prior art of record  
20 since they are each dependent claims that depend from, and therefore include the  
21 claimed limitations of, independent claim 1. Applicant has already indicated why  
22 claim 1 distinguishes over the Kathail/Cavill combination. Further reasons why  
23 these dependent claims distinguish are now described in order.

24 There is no suggestion in the Kathail/Cavill combination to recite where,  
25 within the driver identifier is located within a client/server computer system as

taught by claim 2 of the present disclosure. As such, there is no teaching in the Kathail/Cavill combination to suggest receiving a driver identifier from the client. As to claim 4, there is no teaching in the Kathail/Cavill combination to access a library at the server to use the driver identifier (the using includes selecting a closest matching driver as recited in claim 1) since the Kathail patent does not disclose a client/server configuration, and the Cavill patent does not disclose selecting the closest matching driver.

Considering the claim 5 language “if a particular driver of the plurality of drivers has a corresponding driver identifier that is the same as the received driver identifier, then selecting that driver to install at the server,” the Kathail patent does not disclose a server, or suggest how a driver identifier would be installed at a driver considering the client/server device of the Cavill patent.

Relating to the **claim 15**, there is no suggestion in either the Kathail patent nor the Cavill patent (of the combination thereof) to automatically select at least one of a plurality of drivers corresponding to a peripheral device attached to the client, and then to install, at the server, the selected at least one driver. Claim 15 recites to a peripheral device instead of a printer, as recited in independent claim 1. Several reasons why there is no suggestion have been described above relative to claim 1.

Claim 15 includes the language “installing, at the server, the selected at least one driver” with the “peripheral device attached to the client”. The Kathail patent does not specifically include a server, and as such does not suggest installing a driver, or anything else, at a server. Instead, Hathail pertains to a platform independent system. The Cavill patent does not install at the server the selected at least one of a plurality of drivers corresponding to a peripheral device

1 attached to the client. Instead, Cavill's driver is written in a platform independent  
2 language, and therefore does not require a server to select a closest matching  
3 peripheral device. The only suggestion in the Kathail/Cavill combination upon  
4 considering the present disclosure to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide  
5 a peripheral device (e.g., a printer) attached to a client as suggested by the  
6 teachings of claims 1-34. Since the present claims as applied to the disclosure  
7 does not require a platform independent language, the teachings of the Cavill  
8 patent, as would be used to modify the Kathail patent, teach away from claim 15.

9 Applicant contends that claims 16 to 25 define over the prior art of record  
10 since they are each dependent claims that depend from, and therefore include the  
11 claimed limitations of, independent claim 15. Applicant has already indicated why  
12 claim 15 distinguishes over the Kathail/Cavill combination. Further reasons why  
13 these dependent claims distinguish are now described in order.

14 There is no suggestion in the Kathail/Cavill combination to recite where,  
15 within the driver identifier is automatically selected by a client/server computer  
16 system as taught by claim 15 of the present disclosure. As such, there is no  
17 teaching in the Kathail/Cavill combination to suggest receiving a driver identifier  
18 from the client. As to claim 17, there is no teaching in the Kathail/Cavill  
19 combination to access a library at the server to use the driver identifier (the using  
20 includes selecting a closest matching driver as recited in claim 15 since the Kathail  
21 patent does not disclose a client/server configuration, and the Cavill patent does  
22 not disclose selecting the closest matching driver).

23 Relative to claim 18, there is no teaching to check whether any of the  
24 plurality of drivers has a driver identifier that is the same as the recited driver  
25 identifier, and installing that driver at the server. The Kathail patent does not show

1 a client/server configuration, and Cavill does not show installing the driver that has  
2 a given driver identifier at the client. Several reasons why there is no suggestion  
3 for the rejection based on the combination have been described above relative to  
4 claim 1.

5 To distinguish **claim 26**, as amended, from the Kathail/Cavill combination  
6 several reasons why there is no suggestion for the rejection based on the  
7 combination have been described above relative to claim 1. Additionally, the  
8 Applicant emphasizes that there is no suggestion in either the Kathail patent nor  
9 the Cavill patent to “receive a printer driver identifier for a printer attached to a  
10 client,” and then use the printer driver identifier to select one of a plurality of  
11 printer drivers installed at the server. The Kathail patent does not specifically  
12 include a server, and as such cannot receive the driver identifier for a printer  
13 attached to the client at the server.

14 The Cavill patent, which does include a server, does not receive a driver  
15 identifier for a printer that is used to select a closest matching driver of a plurality  
16 of drivers to install at the server. Instead, Cavill’s driver is written in a platform  
17 independent language, and therefore does not require a server to select one of a  
18 plurality of drivers. The only suggestion in the Kathail/Cavill combination upon  
19 considering the present disclosure to one having ordinary skill in the art to  
20 combine provide a printer attached to a client is provided by the teachings of the  
21 present disclosure. The Cavill patent installs at the server “a driver written in  
22 platform independent language.” Since the present disclosure as claimed does not  
23 require a platform independent language, the Cavill patent teaches away from  
24 claim 26 as claimed. As such, maintaining the rejection based on the  
25 Kathail/Cavill combination is improper.

1       Applicant contends that claims 27 and 28 define over the prior art of record  
2 since they are each dependent claims that depend from, and therefore include the  
3 claimed limitations of, independent claim 26. Applicant has already indicated why  
4 claim 26 distinguishes over the Kathail/Cavill combination. Further reasons why  
5 these dependent claims distinguish are now described in order.

6       To distinguish **claim 29**, as amended, from the Kathail/Cavill combination  
7 several reasons why there is no suggestion for the rejection based on the  
8 combination have been described above relative to claim 1. Additionally, claim 29  
9 includes the language “a driver matching module to select at least one of the  
10 plurality of printer drivers for installation at the server, the selected at least one  
11 printer driver corresponding to a printer attached to the client.” The Kathail patent  
12 does not specifically suggest using a server computer or a client computer since the  
13 computer that selects the printer driver is the one that is connected to the printer.  
14 The Cavill patent installs at the server “a driver written in platform independent  
15 language.” Since the present disclosure does not require a platform independent  
16 language, the Cavill patent teaches away from the presently claimed disclosure.  
17 The only motivation for one having ordinary skill in the art to provide the  
18 Kathail/Cavill combination to “select a printer driver for installation at the server,  
19 the printer driver corresponding to a printer attached to a client” is provided by the  
20 teachings of the claim 29 and the disclosure.

21       Applicant contends that claims 30, 31, and 32 each define over the prior art  
22 of record since they are each dependent claims that depend from, and therefore  
23 include the claimed limitations of, independent claim 29. Applicant has already  
24 indicated why claim 29 distinguishes over the Kathail/Cavill combination. Further  
25 reasons why these dependent claims distinguish are now described in order.

1       Claims 30, 31, and 32 each include conditional language similar to “if a ...,  
2 then install that printer driver at the server.” The Kathail patent does not show a  
3 server or a client arranged in a client/server configuration. The Cavill patent does  
4 not teach installing a selected printer driver at the server. The Kathail/Cavill  
5 combination teaches away from installing the printer driver at the server.

6       To distinguish **claim 33**, as amended, from the Kathail/Cavill combination  
7 several reasons why there is no suggestion for the rejection based on the  
8 combination have been described above relative to claim 1. Claim 33 includes the  
9 limitations:

10      a client computer having a local printer attached thereto; and  
11     a server computer coupled to the client computer via a network, wherein  
...selecting that particular printer driver without regard for whether that particular  
12 printer driver has a corresponding driver version that is the same as a driver  
version received as part of the printer driver identifier for installation on the server  
computer.

13      The Kathail patent does not specifically suggest using a server computer or  
14 a client computer since the computer that selects the printer driver is the one that is  
15 attached to the printer. The Cavill patent installs a driver written in platform  
16 independent language at the server. Since claim 33 does not require a platform  
17 independent language, the Cavill patent teaches away from the teachings of present  
18 claim 33. The only motivation in the Kathail/Cavill combination upon considering  
19 the present claim 33 to one having ordinary skill in the art to “select a printer  
20 driver for installation at the server, the printer driver corresponding to a printer  
21 attached to a client” is provided by the teachings of claim 33 as described in the  
22 present disclosure. Several reasons why there is no suggestion for the rejection  
23 based on the combination have been described above relative to claim 1.  
24  
25

Applicant submits that claim 34 defines over the prior art of record since it is a dependent claim that depends from, and therefore includes the claimed limitations of, independent claim 33. The Applicant has already indicated why claim 33 distinguishes over the Kathail/Cavill combination.

Claims 34 includes the language wherein the client computer transmits the printer driver identifier to the server computer. The Kathail patent does not show a computer system segmented into client computers and server computers. The Cahill patent does not suggest transmitting a printer driver. The Kathail/Cavill combination teaches away from transmitting the printer driver to the server.

In paragraph 13 of the Office Action dated July 18, 2002, the Office Action dated July 18, 2002 suggests a close review of U.S. Patent 5,920,725 that issued on July 6, 1999 to Ma et al. (hereinafter the Ma patent). The Applicant indicates that Ma discloses a distributed client-server application that is modified when it is running. While Ma describes a client-server application, the Ma reference does not remedy the deficiencies in the Kathail/Cavill combination as described above.

### **Conclusion**

Claims 1 to 34 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the subject application.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: 11/14/02

By: Glenn B. Foster  
Glenn B. Foster  
Reg. No. 32,676

1      **Marked-up Version of the Specification:**

2      Please amend the specification as follows:

3      Please replace the paragraph from page 1, line 22, to page 2, line 10 with  
4      the following paragraph:

5      Client users frequently use peripheral devices physically attached to the  
6      client machines. For example, a user may wish to attach a printer to the user's  
7      client computer (a "local" printer) in order to print data generated by an application  
8      that is running on the server computer. To do this, currently the user must  
9      manually install the local printer and redirect the printer queue created by the  
10     server to the I/O port of the client computer to which the printer is connected.  
11     Such manual installation of peripheral devices is undesirable because it requires  
12     significant time and effort on the part of the user. A co-pending application (U.S.  
13     Patent Application No. [09/\_\_\_\_\_] 09/458,365) entitled "Automatic Detection  
14     And Installation Of Client Peripheral Devices By A Server", to Tad Brockway,  
15     Madan Appiah, Adam Overton, and Ritu Bahl, filed concurrently herewith,  
16     (Attorney Docket No. MS1-432US) describes a system which resolves many of  
17     these manual installation problems by automatically detecting such devices and  
18     installing and corresponding device drivers at the server.

19

20      **Marked-up Version of the Pending Claims Under 37 C.F.R. Section**

21      **1.121(c)(1)(ii):**

22

23      Amend the claims as follows and in accordance with 37 C.F.R. Section  
24      1.121(c)(1)(ii), by which the Applicant submits the following marked up version

1 only for claims being changed by the current amendment, wherein the markings  
2 are shown by brackets (for deleted matter) and/or underlining (for added matter):

3       Claims 1, 15, 25, 26, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, and 34 have been amended.  
4

5       1. (Amended) A method in a server-client environment, the method  
6 comprising:

7             receiving at the server a driver identifier for a printer [attached to] that can  
8 print information at the client;

9             using the driver identifier to select a closest matching driver of a plurality of  
10 drivers to install at the server;

11             installing, at the server, the selected driver; and

12             allowing applications executing on the server to print to the printer using  
13 the installed driver.

14  
15       15. (Amended) A method implemented in a server in a server-client  
16 environment, the method comprising:

17             automatically selecting at least one of a plurality of drivers corresponding to  
18 a peripheral device attached to the client; and

19             installing, at the server, the selected at least one driver wherein the server  
20 can interface with the peripheral device using the driver.

21  
22       25. (Amended) [At] The method of claim 15, wherein at least one  
23 computer-readable memory [containing] contains a computer program that is  
24 executable by a processor to perform the method [recited in claim 15].

1  
2       **26.** (Amended) One or more computer-readable media having stored  
3 thereon a computer program that, when executed by one or more processors of a  
4 server in a client-server system, causes the one or more processors to:

5           receive a printer driver identifier for a printer attached to a client;  
6           use the printer driver identifier to select one of a plurality of printer drivers  
7 to install at the server according to the following,

8              if a particular printer driver of the plurality of printer drivers has a  
9 corresponding printer driver identifier that is the same as the received  
10 printer driver identifier, then selecting that particular driver,

11              if a particular printer driver of the plurality of printer drivers  
12 currently has a corresponding printer driver identifier that is different than  
13 the received printer driver identifier but that corresponds to the same printer  
14 driver as the received printer driver identifier, then selecting that particular  
15 printer driver, and

16              if a particular printer driver of the plurality of printer drivers has a  
17 corresponding driver name that is the same as a driver name received as part  
18 of the printer driver identifier, then selecting that particular printer driver  
19 without regard for whether that particular printer driver has a corresponding  
20 driver version that is the same as a driver version received as part of the  
21 printer driver identifier; and

22              install[, at the server,] the selected printer driver at the server.

23  
24       **29.** (Amended) An apparatus including a server and a client, the  
25 apparatus comprising:

1           a driver library including a plurality of printer drivers; and  
2           a driver matching module to select at least one of the plurality of printer  
3        drivers for installation [on the apparatus] at the server, the selected at least one  
4        printer driver corresponding to a printer attached to [a] the client [computer].  
5

6           **30.** (Amended) An apparatus as recited in claim 29, wherein the driver  
7        matching module [is] further [to]:

8           [check] checks whether any of the plurality of drivers has a corresponding  
9        driver identifier that is the same as a received driver identifier; and

10          wherein if a particular driver of the plurality of drivers has a corresponding  
11        driver identifier that is the same as the received driver identifier, then install that  
12        driver [on the apparatus] at the server.

13  
14          **31.** (Amended) An apparatus as recited in claim 29, further comprising:

15          a mapping table to map previous driver identifiers to subsequent driver  
16        identifiers;

17          wherein the driver matching module [is] further [to check] checks the  
18        mapping table to determine whether any of the plurality of drivers currently has a  
19        corresponding driver identifier that is different than a received driver identifier but  
20        that is a subsequent driver identifier mapped to the received driver identifier as a  
21        previous driver identifier; and

22          if a particular driver of the plurality of drivers currently has a corresponding  
23        driver identifier that is different than a received driver identifier but that is a  
24        subsequent driver identifier mapped to the received driver identifier as a previous

1 driver identifier, then the driver matching module [is] further [to install] installs  
2 that driver at the server.

3  
4 32. (Amended) An apparatus as recited in claim 29, wherein the driver  
5 matching module [is] further [to]:

6 [check] checks whether any of the plurality of printer drivers has a  
7 corresponding driver name that is the same as a received driver name; and

8 wherein if a particular printer driver of the plurality of printer drivers has a  
9 corresponding driver name that is the same as the received driver name, then  
10 install that printer driver [on the apparatus] at the server without regard for  
11 whether that particular printer driver has a corresponding driver version that is the  
12 same as a received driver version.

13  
14 33. (Amended) A system comprising:

15 a client computer having a local printer attached thereto; and

16 a server computer coupled to the client computer via a network, wherein the  
17 server computer includes,

18 a driver library including a plurality of printer drivers, and

19 a driver matching module to select at least one of the plurality of  
20 printer drivers for installation on the server computer to allow applications  
21 executing on the server computer to print to the local printer, the driver  
22 matching module selecting one of the plurality of printer drivers for  
23 installation based on a printer driver identifier and according to the  
24 following,

1           if a particular printer driver of the plurality of printer drivers  
2        has a corresponding printer driver identifier that is the same as the  
3        received printer driver identifier, then selecting that particular driver  
4        for installation,

5           if a particular printer driver of the plurality of printer drivers  
6        currently has a corresponding printer driver identifier that is different  
7        than the received printer driver identifier but that corresponds to the  
8        same printer driver as the received printer driver identifier, then  
9        selecting that particular printer driver for installation, and

10          if a particular printer driver of the plurality of printer drivers  
11        has a corresponding driver name that is the same as a driver name  
12        received as part of the printer driver identifier, then selecting that  
13        particular printer driver without regard for whether that particular  
14        printer driver has a corresponding driver version that is the same as a  
15        driver version received as part of the printer driver identifier for  
16        installation on the server computer.

17  
18       **34.** (Amended) A system as recited in claim 33, wherein the client  
19       computer [is to transmit] transmits the printer driver identifier to the server  
20       computer.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25